

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

March 1, 2007

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dennis Cope, Sally Promer-Nichols, Mery Velastegui, David Wobker

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steven Fischer, Senior Planner; Kerry Kriner, Associate Planner; Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:00 PM. Design Review Board members Robert Hall, Lee Madrid and David Scott Meade were excused.

**MINUTES**

**January 18, 2007:**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 18, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS WRITTEN. MOTION CARRIED (2-0-2), WITH MS. VELASTEGUI AND MR. WOBKER ABSTAINING.**

**February 1, 2007:**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 1, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS CORRECTED. MOTION CARRIED (3-0-1), WITH MR. WOBKER ABSTAINING.**

**APPROVAL**

**L070072, Microsoft West Campus**

**Description:** Demolition of ten existing buildings and redevelopment of a 42-acre site with four office buildings, a four-level underground parking garage, and a commons building, including employee amenities + meeting rooms above the garage.

**Location:** 15305 NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street

**Architect:** Charlene Smith with Callison Architecture

**Applicant:** Terry Bendrick

**Staff Contact:** Kerry Kriner – 425.556.2464

Kerry Kriner, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. Staff recommends approval with conditions, including that the lighting plan be subject to Technical Review Committee approval.

Mr. Cope requested an explanation of “Green Streets” on page 3, in response to which Ms. Kriner explained that NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street is designated as a Green Street because it is focused on transit-oriented development. She described Microsoft’s contributions toward this Green Street.

Rick Phillippe, 1420 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue #2400, Seattle, WA 98101, explained that they had brought an updated model for this presentation. Also new for this presentation was that they had identified a micro-environment for each of the four signature buildings with the individual themes of Mountain, Meadow, Forest and Coast. There will be 1.4 million square feet of construction on 42 acres, with a 4,600-square-foot underground garage. There would be one major entry point and two other entry points into the West Campus to disperse the traffic. They wanted to make a triptych theme: humanity, technology and nature. He showed several renderings. The glass they are using does not have as much color as the renderings and is very high-performing with a high level of transparency. This glass can meet the energy

requirements, but from the outside people can be seen moving around inside. There are different signature stones to help ground the buildings and create an entity for each of the individual building themes. They created a fair amount of separation for each building. To tie the whole campus together and ground the campus, they created a sense of weight with stone bases, which are typically 38-40 inches tall around the site and anchor the buildings, holding them down and creating connectivity. He showed renderings of each building. He also showed the loading dock. They did a slight blending with the cast-in-place concrete. He described the approaches to the front doors. The stairwells would be made of glass.

Mark Brennan, Callison, 1420 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue #2400, Seattle, WA 98101, spoke about the Commons Area. He went through the elevations, describing the geodetic outsides as being more solid but fractured at the corners with glass, and more exposed at the Commons Area. He said that the dark soffit material is consistent and links the buildings and the channel expression. The stone base wraps into the interior courtyard area. On the exterior building facades, they are using the precast and a corrugated metal screening, accentuating the contrasts between solid and transparent. There is an interplay of sloped roofs that marks the pedestrian areas and an interplay of glass and solids.

Mark Brumbaugh, 600 N 85<sup>th</sup> #102, Seattle, WA 98103, presented the specifications on the landscapes for the individual garden spaces. He described Building 92 as having a distinct character but the other four buildings as fairly similar. Each building would have plant materials with seasonal interest and some grasses. The structures would all be linked together with accent plants and with the warm woodlike character of the buildings. They would keep the hardscape out in the middle, and the open spaces would be similar to those in Whistler. They are planning a series of water features there that would be small in scale and have cascading water.

Regarding sustainability, only the Building 96 would be rated for LEED Silver, however all the new building would be expected to meet those standards.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Cope:

- Confirmed that the roof of the Commons Building was a metallic champagne required for sustainability and not the same color as the former Eddie Bauer building.
- Inquired how the stormwater would be handled on the lid. (Mr. Brumbaugh explained that the stormwater would typically be absorbed. The garage roof has a 1% breach from side to side. Stormwater falling in the center on the Commons Area would be picked up by storm drainage.)
- Thought this to be a fine and extremely well integrated project.
- Thought it to be the most intelligent group of buildings in Redmond.
- Was strongly in support of the project.
- Appreciated the work.

##### Ms. Velastegui:

- Loved the landscape plan.
- Loved the combination of color, shapes and elements.
- Thought this to be one of the best landscape plans she had ever seen.
- Inquired about service entry. (Mr. Phillippe responded that each building has a service entry in the back.)
- Confirmed there are four levels of parking in the underground garage.
- Loved the water feature in the Commons Area.

##### Mr. Wobker:

- Confirmed that the applicant was okay with the staff recommendations.
- Thought this project was incredible.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thought it a great project.
- Commented that the project has really strong concepts.
- Had wondered how they would fit some regular buildings in with that unique Building 92.

Ms. Kriner reported that staff would be working toward seamless coordination of the landscape and site plans for West Campus and Building 92.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY MR. WOBKER TO APPROVE L070072, MICROSOFT WEST CAMPUS, WITH STAFF-RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:**

- (1) **Lighting Plan** subject to approval of Technical Review Committee. Applicant must provide lighting fixture cut sheets.
- (2) **A minimum of two pedestrian/bicycle linkages** shall be provided to the public trail adjacent to SR520 other than linkages from NE 40<sup>th</sup> and NE 36<sup>th</sup> Streets. Contingent upon Microsoft obtaining permission from WSDOT.
- (3) **Provide screening for mechanical equipment, outdoor storage, and trash and recycling containers, working with City staff to ensure most effective screening solutions are providing for ground-mounted mechanical equipment.**
- (4) **Standard Presentation Materials Inconsistencies Condition**

**MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MR. WOBKER TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 8:07 P.M. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**PRE070014, Redmond Cycle Shop Addition**

**Description:** Proposed 600-sf addition to bicycle sales and repair shop

**Location:** 16205 Redmond Way

**Applicant:** Steve Grant with Kovach Architects

**Staff Contact:** Asma Jeelani / 425.556.2443

Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report, stating that the applicant proposed increasing the square footage with a new addition to include a new entry and a new shed roof, increasing visibility of the building on NE Redmond Way, and recladding the building with metal siding.

Steve Grant, the applicant, said he thought adding a base to the building was a good idea and recladding with metal siding would give a punchier look than the wooden siding. The current owners have let the landscape go, so they would redo that.

**COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:**

Mr. Cope:

- Inquired what would happen in the display court. (Mr. Grant responded that bikes would be shown.)
- Liked what they had done.
- Thought it would be cooler if they could do what is on the last page.
- Cautioned that they be rigid on the front elevation because Redmond is pretty rigid in its uplighting requirements.
- Thought the materials to be fine; nothing around it to emulate.
- Was fine with everything.
- Likes the three proposed sculptures on the top.

Ms. Velastegui:

- Noted that the door entry was not on page 2.0 of the plans; looked like a window on the side in the middle of the colonnade.
- Liked the project; thought it fun.
- Liked the metal siding and thought the wood accents were good to sustain it.
- Loved the beams.

- Loved the bikes but did not want to see old bikes used—wanted something classy and modern—must be a sculpture.
- Supported the project.
- Suggested finding a way to locate some planters to cut down on the pavement.

Mr. Wobker:

- Thought the bikes would help to sell the red roof.
- Agreed that the sheet metal siding was good.
- Thought it was a nice addition; perfect for the use.
- Supported keeping the bike sculptures.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Confirmed that the pavement would be the existing.

There was agreement that the applicant was ready to return for approval.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**PRE070013, Microsoft – Building 92**

**Description:** Existing former Eddie Bauer Headquarters to be renovated into a mix of corporate learning center and offices. Adding two stair towers, elevator and canopies, and relocating loading dock.

**Location:** 15010 NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Andy Paroline

**Staff Contact:** Kerry Kriner 425.556.2464

Kerry Kriner, Associate Planner, presented the staff report, explaining that this is a component of the West Campus project and would be Microsoft's Learning Center with classrooms, a library, the company store, and a medical clinic with a pharmacy. They have had to add two stairways, improve the loading dock, and improve the main entrance with canopy structures.

Scott Hunter with nbj, 223 Yale Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104, described this building as also being a visitor center and the most public building on the campus. The existing front door would be accessed off the reconfigured entry road. There would be secondary access points. There had been some reconfiguration of the site plan. The existing loading dock had to be reconfigured to the new grades.

Jin Ah Park, also with nbj, reiterated their understanding that Building 92 is a building that Redmond likes very much. The Commons would be taking cues from this building. They want to keep in character of Building 92 and continue to use existing materials, such as concrete block, brick, metal cladding and curtain walling. She showed the main entrance on which they would be adding a canopy to make the entry more obvious. There would also be a staff entry in the back, a secondary entry mainly for the learning function that could be used for the entire building. She showed on the elevation that the stair had been expanded to be more gracious. She noted that the building has more of a public interface now, and they felt it important for the clinic area to be light.

Mark Brumbaugh, 600 N 85<sup>th</sup> #102, Seattle, WA 98103, explained that the vast majority of the landscaping for Building 92 would keep with the past woodsy character of Eddie Bauer but also would integrate into the West Campus. There is a lot of ivy and other things that need to be cleaned up. For the next review they would have more detail. The entry is underground and hard to see now so the intent is to open that up somewhat. They plan to create a patio area with limited outdoor seating. The loading dock has not been fully resolved from a site perspective. The existing building does not have much of a loading area, but the new use of the building would have.

Mr. Hunter said that they would be looking at synergy between the buildings. They are not doing on-site food service, but there would be a lot of catering going on there.

Steve Fischer, Senior Planner, reminded the Board that this is a superior design-award building, with only three or four other buildings of that caliber in Redmond. When that building was first reviewed by the Board in May 1994, the most-liked features were: the relationship of the building to the trees, the use of

materials, the large overhang roof reminiscent of a tent fly, and the dramatic entryway. He urged that the additions and remodel to this structure need to keep in mind that this is an award-winning building.

Ms. Kriner pointed out that there is no proposal to put additional mechanical on the roof. She added that staff had discussion with Microsoft on the extent of the canopies and explained that at the next review there would probably be several smaller canopies because the canopies are probably larger than they need to be.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Cope:

- Thought the package was very clear and easy to understand. He appreciated the graphics.
- Appreciated the integration to the rest of the West Campus.
- Commented there are two things the applicant should continue to study. (1) The idea of loading for this building being adjacent to the loading for the building next to it. (2) The very important pedestrian way from that existing wooded area to the Commons, which currently looks like they are trying to skinny between two loading docks to get through there. He did not feel that the solution for the pedestrian was there yet.
- Thought there was a lost opportunity since this is becoming a lot more public building. He saw no addressing of wheelchair access for this difficult-to-access building that would house the clinic. He encouraged them to be more sensitive to that.
- Understood what they are trying to do with the entry on 04.0 because the major different change of use requires a new front door, but he was sorry to see the landscaping go when there was the opportunity to do something special with the landscaping.
- Commented that the shape of the canopy shown on 04.1, in fact all of the canopies, seems to have nothing to do with the unique roof. Suggested a redesign of the canopies.

##### Ms. Velastegui:

- Agreed with Mr. Cope's comments on the west side to make that a new connection. This building needs to be wheelchair accessible and could be by using the existing ramp.
- Was disappointed by the canopies. The design did not match the strong element that the building had. She understood that the new needs for this building require a change in the primary entrance, but on page 04.1, when the old landscape is taken away, the opportunity is lost to integrate the existing landscape with the new canopy. The canopy is speaking a different language than the rest of the building.
- Commented that on 04.2 the canopy has no relation with the glass in the background—not a friendly experience.
- Suggested that the applicant consider playing with the elements to go to a middle ground. The scale of the canopy is important. Need to determine what would be the best height.
- Appreciated the update on the north stair rendering on page 04.3. Thought that elevation that faces the Commons Area looked a little better, but thought it looked like an added element in need of being part of the building. She thought there might be a way to make the stair tower element look as if a part of the building. She suggested that they work more on integration.
- Was glad to see that they downsized the box of the other stair tower.
- Thought the window fenestration was a good element.

##### Mr. Wobker:

- Thought the plans made sense.
- Agreed that the building was too light and needed something heavy, maybe even a piece of the stone at the base of the Commons.
- Agreed that he hated to lose the uniqueness of that stairway going up with the plants.
- Thought the awning at the main entrance looked the most thought out and had architecture and style to it.
- Suggested that the employee entrance needed more pizzazz.
- Liked the way the clinic is tucked in there to make good use of that wasted area.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thought the main entrance was just a placeholder, but needed to say more, needed to be a special place, and needed to capture a special feeling.
- Understood about the trees feeling too close.
- Thought that the north façade appeared to be reaching toward the Commons—but the sidewalk did not go toward the Commons but to the right. She thought there should be a step down to the Commons. Seemed like there was a box put on the end because they needed a stair tower.

There was agreement that the Design Review Board would see this for one more preapplication review. There should be more balance at the entryway. The entryway should be more dominant. The thin wall along the left side does not make it grand and needs to relate to the material on the right side as well. The front canopy and entrance need more work.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MS. VELASTEGUI TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:15 PM. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

---

**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

---

**RECORDING SECRETARY**